



22 in jail for Christmas

# THE CHALLENGE OF NORTH PICKENHAM

By ALAN LOVELL

No. 1,174 London, Dec. 26, 1958. 6d.

US Air Express  
Edition 10 cents

SWAFFHAM DEMONSTRATION

## 'ARE YOU SHOCKED?'

*The following is an extract from the Very Rev. Dr. George McLeod's BBC Home Service talk in the "Lift Up Your Hearts" series, broadcast on December 16.*

**J**ESUS comes to shock. When Jesus had been born to Mary in Bethlehem of Judaea, a sword pierced her heart. She had an intuition that much sorrow would come to her through this child who was born . . . The hearts of a great many mothers in Bethlehem were pierced with a sword, right then and there. It is all very shocking. Herod the King . . . issued the instruction that all male babies in Bethlehem were to be put to the sword . . . It is very shocking indeed that the first result of Jesus being born into the world was a pogrom: a massacre . . .

The French have a proverb that "the good can be the enemy of the best." It is good to have laws . . . But there is a higher law than "laws." That higher Law is Love . . . A rock is a hard thing . . . But in certain conditions an acorn can split a rock and come to flourish as a tree. This is forever happening in our world: which was made for Love. But a lot of good things get split open in the process.

### CHALLENGE OF TODAY

## Unflinching tax-refuser goes to jail

**THE Reverend Maurice McCrackin, the American Presbyterian minister who refused to pay his taxes because they were used to "build a war machine," has been sentenced to six months imprisonment and a fine of \$250.**

The U.S. District Court Judge who sentenced him unleashed a scathing attack on Mr. McCrackin and pacifists in general. Passing sentence, he said, "You have admitted giving your donations to the Fellowship of Reconciliation and the Peacemakers instead of paying taxes. Those groups are notorious and have overwhelming Soviet sympathies. We won't go into whether you are a card carrying Communist

**J**UST before the demonstrators entered Air Ministry property at the North Pickenham Rocket Base on Saturday, they stopped to consider their action. Some thought, others prayed. If any one incident symbolises the nature of the action that the demonstrators took over this weekend, it was the sight of Michael Scott praying quietly in the open Norfolk countryside.

At that moment, the moral force that is easy to talk about but hard to put into practice, showed through clearly. One saw that the demonstrators were right when they said that this was a moral protest against an immoral policy.

On Saturday the depth of the demonstrators' convictions was present in all their actions. It was in the calm way that they met the warnings of the police with an open statement of their intentions; when they moved into the path of the lorries that tried to come into or out of the camp; in their cheerfulness when they were ejected (even the police laughed when one of the demonstrators who was being carried out



Michael Randle

could have had time to consider their positions very seriously.

The local people of Swaffham who were around when the meeting took place in the market square on Saturday lunch time or when the demonstrators were ejected from the base were generally hostile. Tomatoes were thrown at the microphone and there were plenty of jeers. None of the people who were hostile seemed to appreciate the risks that the demonstrators were prepared to take in order to show their concern.

More depressing than this perhaps was



is very shocking indeed that the first result of Jesus being born into the world was a pogrom: a massacre . . .

The French have a proverb that "the good can be the enemy of the best." It is good to have laws . . . But there is a higher law than "laws." That higher Law is Love . . . A rock is a hard thing . . . But in certain conditions an acorn can split a rock and come to flourish as a tree. This is forever happening in our world: which was made for Love. But a lot of good things get split open in the process.

## CHALLENGE OF TODAY

When men, inspired of the new spirit, demanded a fuller life for all and combined into what came to be called Trade Unions, it led to many gallows for the innocents.

It is all very shocking this coming of the Spirit of Christ into the world.

To what does it all challenge us today? Jesus, when he became a teacher, had a tremendous word of invective against all the people who let things stay put whether in things of the state or of the Church. Each generation applauds the prophets of the past, just as you were applauding in your hearts—in these last two minutes. But how often (Jesus asks), the applauders of previous progress want things to "stay put," where their own day and generation is concerned!

## CONSENT OF SILENCE

What, for instance, did you feel like last week when you read in the paper of those men and women in Norfolk who tried to impede Nuclear Development for purposes of war? Were they just breaking the law, or were they perhaps breaking the law for the larger good? You and I of course are respectable. We do not break the law. But are we thereby exonerated? Are we (it is conceivable), each one of us, fashioning by our silence one of those tiny bombs that will kill a million people; rather than clamant that the new truth should be born? Is your middle name Herod, after all? And is mine? Defence of Country is good. Deterrence is good. But in the modern world is "the good the enemy of the best?" Has "time made the ancient good (of Defence) uncouth?" Are you shocked? I hope so.

**THE Reverend Maurice McCrackin, the American Presbyterian minister who refused to pay his taxes because they were used to "build a war machine," has been sentenced to six months imprisonment and a fine of \$250.**

The U.S. District Court Judge who sentenced him unleashed a scathing attack on Mr. McCrackin and pacifists in general. Passing sentence, he said, "You have admitted giving your donations to the Fellowship of Reconciliation and the Peacemakers instead of paying taxes. Those groups are notorious and have overwhelming Soviet sympathies. We won't go into whether you are a card carrying Communist or not."

The Judge continued: "Tax money is to provide the United States of America with a means of defending itself against Communist Russia. Even this morning the newspaper accounts were rattling the bones of war."

"They (the Communists) say that they will take America without firing a shot. And here is Mr. McCrackin saying that he will not give taxes to the Government because it is evil."

"I don't know of a more pious way to be called a traitor than that."

## Psychiatrists examine

The day of the trial was the fourteenth day of the fast that Mr. McCrackin is carrying out as a protest.

Mr. McCrackin is to appeal against his conviction.

Previous to the trial an attempt had been made to get Mr. McCrackin certified as insane. After three psychiatrists had examined him, they declared that he was "mentally competent and able to understand the proceedings against him."

Any letters of support for Mr. McCrackin's courageous stand should be sent to his church, West Cincinnati St. Barnabas Church, 916 Poplar Street, Cincinnati, U.S.A.

All persons arrested are to come before Petty Sessions on December 29th at 10.30 a.m.

**Those refusing bail on Saturday and spending Christmas in H.M. Prison, Norwich:**

Michael Randle, Will Warren, Chris Farley, Laurens Otter, Cyril King, Oliver Mahler, Philip Cooke, Michael Scott, Maurice Jones, Geoffrey Alexander, Tom Woodall, Ian Dixon, John Dennithorne, Francis Deutsh, John Marks, David Graham, Kenneth Longman, David Britten, Brian Wallis.

**In Holloway Prison:**

Miss April Carter, Mrs. Mary Chisholm and Mrs. Mildred Slater.

that is easy to talk about but hard to put into practice, showed through clearly. One saw that the demonstrators were right when they said that this was a moral protest against an immoral policy.

On Saturday the depth of the demonstrators' convictions was present in all their actions. It was in the calm way that they met the warnings of the police with an open statement of their intentions; when they moved into the path of the lorries that tried to come into or out of the camp; in their cheerfulness when they were ejected (even the police laughed when one of the demonstrators who was being carried out by four policemen started to sing "We shall not be moved"); it was in the odd remarks that they made—"I would have lost my job if I'd been arrested," said one young girl, "Don't mention my name or my husband might lose his job," said a middle aged woman; and it was most obvious when the first bunch of demonstrators to be ejected reformed their ranks and marched back again.

## Conspiracy threat

The police reacted in a similar fashion. They were invariably polite and they handled the demonstrators as gently as possible. (However, it should be added that when the press had left the entrance to the base, one of the last of the demonstrators to be ejected was dragged instead of carried and dumped into a pool of water).

The real black spot in the day's events was an early morning attempt of the police to frighten the demonstrators off. The threat of a conspiracy charge against both the coach drivers and owners and the demonstrators was obviously intended to do this. There seems to be no reason why the authorities could not have let the Direct Action Committee know much earlier about the possibility of a charge of this kind so that all the demonstrators

## THOSE ARRESTED

**Those accepting bail on Saturday and Sunday:**

Malcolm Pittock, Lisel Dales, Ines Randle, Frances Edwards, Thomas Wolburn, Dave Goodman, Duncan John Gracie, Robert Hinshelwood, Gopal Koyan, Bernard Hickling, Graham Petchie, Pat Kelly, Norman Cordaw, Barbara Woods, Colin Johnson, Robert Matthew Benwell Palmer, Stephen Trevor Hodgson, William David Bell, Peter Edwin Bowring, Mrs. Pat Sears, Mrs. Joyce Brodden, Miss Mary Evelyn Poppleton, and Miss Sarah Janice Webb.

The charge: Willfully obstructing police in the course of their duty.

## Michael Randle

could have had time to consider their positions very seriously.

The local people of Swaffham who were around when the meeting took place in the market square on Saturday lunch time or when the demonstrators were ejected from the base were generally hostile. Tomatoes were thrown at the microphone and there were plenty of jeers. None of the people who were hostile seemed to appreciate the risks that the demonstrators were prepared to take in order to show their concern.

More depressing than this perhaps was the kind of arguments that were used to defend the rocket bases. The hoary old argument, "If somebody hit you, wouldn't you hit them back?" can't have been used so often for a long time; and numerous incredible statements about Russia were made. Some of the doubts were, of course, more serious. It is not easy to give a ready answer to a man who asks where he can earn his living if he leaves the rocket base (though the readiness of some of the demonstrators to lose their jobs should have gone some of the way to meeting this argument). One can also understand the challenge that no Swaffham people were on the demonstration—though as a matter of fact this wasn't true, there being two people from the town who took part in the demonstration.

## Courageous 46

When all is said and done, one thing still remains with me, the courage of the people who went into the base. They weren't special people, they were hard to characterise; there was the hero of the South Wales unemployed of the 'thirties, John Dennithorne, there were friends of mine like Michael Randle, sales organiser of Peace News, and Christopher Farley of the editorial staff, there were women who had children, and young single girls. One thing united them all—a belief that nuclear weapons are immoral and threaten us all. This weekend at North Pickenham they challenged everybody who supports the manufacture of these weapons to examine their consciences. Their challenge will not go unheeded.

As we go to press, 46 of the demonstrators have been arrested and 22 are in custody.

We urge readers to send a Christmas card as a token of support for the stand that they have taken.



# WHY NO GOVERNMENT ENQUIRY?

IN April it will be two years since Commander Sir Stephen King-Hall first called for an official investigation of non-violent resistance as a national defence policy instead of nuclear weapons. The idea has gained much support, but no such enquiry has yet begun.

This appeal has been aimed largely at those "practical" people who are rarely convinced by pacifist arguments and who ask: what's wrong with the policy we've got? The policy we've got then could be criticised on many grounds. But let's look at only one: it doesn't work.

## No defence

Nuclear weapons might be justified on grounds of defence: they help to defend people against injury, attack or destruction.

But they are no defence. And there is no defence against them.

Mr. Duncan Sandys, British Minister of Defence (speaking in Australia in August, 1957) declared that the British Government had taken "a very bold step in deciding not to do the impossible(!)" He said: "We decided not to defend the whole country, but to defend only our bomber bases. I must pay tribute to the people of Great Britain for the readiness with which they have accepted these harsh but inescapable facts."

Mr. Sandys has really declared that defence by and against these weapons is impossible. Yet the British, American and Russian governments continue to place nuclear weapons at the foundation of their defence policies.

## Deterrent?

There can be only one other "justification" for nuclear weapons: their possession by both blocs is an *absolute* guarantee that neither side will ever use them, intentionally or unintentionally, under any conditions whatsoever.

No such guarantee can be given.

Even the advocates of the "deterrent" theory make no such claim. They believe the odds are that the "deterrent" will deter, but they cannot be absolutely certain. Mr. Sandys has admitted that there are grave dangers involved. US officials have admitted that on several occasions US H-bombers have, because of errors, set off for the Soviet Union.

There is always the chance—however

## THE CASE FOR UNARMED DEFENCE RECALLED BY Gene Sharp, M.A.

*Former Assistant Editor of Peace News.*

- They have no vision for the future.
- They can offer humanity no hope.
- They are cowards.

Of course, almost all who favour retaining nuclear weapons claim they want to get rid of them "universally," by "negotiation" and "agreement." Dulles and Stevenson, Macmillan and Gaitskill, Khrushchov and—(oops!)—all say it.

Let's not be fooled.

Twelve years of such "negotiation" have ended. Both sides now have more destructive nuclear weapons and more of them than 12 years ago. We may not have another 12 years to watch the same tragedy all over again, only this time, perhaps, with a new cast, scenery, costumes and slight revisions in the script.

There is a way out: unilateral renunciation of these weapons.

It must begin with the country whose people have enough vision and human spirit to enable them to triumph over the forces of fear and destruction in their midst. This role may be reserved for the peoples of Britain.

## NVR for defence

The rejection of nuclear weapons requires finding a radically different defence policy. As Commander Sir Stephen King-Hall has pointed out, there is good reason on strategic grounds alone for believing that the rejection of nuclear weapons today in reality also means the rejection of all weapons of war. What good are tanks against hydrogen bombs?

The alternative to nuclear weapons, then, lies in the non-military sphere. The alternative must be essentially a pacifist policy.

But to favour adopting such a policy today does not require one to be a "pacifist" or to accept all of the pacifist contentions.

There had been a number of proposals for non-violent resistance as a defence policy before Sir Stephen's call, by Cecil Hinshaw in the U.S. and Prof Arne Naess in Norway, for example. And the Dutch "Church and Peace" organisation in 1952 published "A New Road to Defence" ("Nieuwe Weerbaarheid"), discussing non-

possibilities of a defence policy based on non-violent resistance.

At a time of unprecedented danger, Sir Stephen has made many people who will never be pacifists seriously consider this alternative. As Baroness Wootton declared in an article in PN, this was the breakthrough. Wide interest and support for an inquiry has been aroused.

Sir Stephen—if he had done nothing else in his whole life—will be remembered for this courageous and prophetic contribution.

What is this non-violent resistance? That's a long story, but it includes: economic and other boycotts; industrial strikes; sit-in and sit-down strikes; general strikes; parades; marches; picketing; newspapers and leaflets (legal and illegal); pilgrimages; silence; mass remaining in homes; tax refusal; other forms of non-co-operation; and civil disobedience.

## Disobey dictators

Such resistance is in large degree based upon the assumption that a regime's power ultimately depends upon the population's belief in it and upon their co-operation and obedience.

Even under totalitarianism?

The American political scientist Karl W. Deutsch at a conference on totalitarianism held at the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in March, 1953, declared:

"The third characteristic of totalitarian government, the enforcement of decisions, depends to a large extent on the compliance habits of the population. Compliance and enforcement are interdependent . . ." He said: ". . . we could imagine a situation where nobody obeys voluntarily any decision of the totalitarian system, and everybody has to be compelled to obey at pistol point, or under conditions of literally ever-present threat and ever-present supervision."

"This," he continued, ". . . would be prohibitively expensive and, in fact, no government could be carried on on such a basis."

That way of defeating tyranny certainly wouldn't be easy, but at least it seems to make more sense than nuclear weapons.

## Invasion?

nuclear weapons would win it the admiration of humanity—meaning it would have sympathetic friends in time of need.

Its knowledge of and ability to use non-violent resistance would make it dangerous as a victim for an aggressor—there would be vast difficulties in ruling a whole nation trained in how most effectively to defy and undermine tyranny. This might be a more effective deterrent than nuclear weapons ever could be.

These factors would all serve to deter an invasion. If the invasion came anyhow, the defence policy would go into action.

## Heroes wanted

It would not be easy. Resisting without killing would require at least as much heroism, courage and greatness as any war—probably much more. There would be suffering. There would be danger.

If the resisting nation succeeded in causing the invading army and regime—after a short or protracted struggle—to withdraw, the example could well mean the beginning of the end of war and tyranny.

At worst, if the occupation lasted a very long time, at least humanity would still be alive and the future would still hold hope.

Non-violent resistance as a defence policy is not a way for cowards; it is not for those men who would rather kill the last child than go to a concentration camp as part of their resistance to tyranny.

There are risks. Today there is no way without risks and dangers. But the risk in this policy is not humanicide. It is not the end of all hope. It is the risk that we, too, shall have to suffer as thousands of others have done before us in the struggle for justice, freedom and peace, for the principles in which they have believed.

## At least investigate

There are vast problems involved in adopting non-violent resistance as a national defence policy. As Sir Stephen points out, these problems need to be carefully studied. For example: information about the methods must be spread; the population must be trained in their use; the strategy and tactics of NVR under various conditions must be studied and analysed.

There are also social, economic and political corollaries with this method of resistance—just as the military method has its corollaries in these areas.



There can be only one other "justification" for nuclear weapons: their possession by both blocs is an *absolute* guarantee that neither side will ever use them, intentionally or unintentionally, under any conditions whatsoever.

No such guarantee can be given.

Even the advocates of the "deterrent" theory make no such claim. They believe the odds are that the "deterrent" will deter, but they cannot be absolutely certain. Mr. Sandys has admitted that there are grave dangers involved. US officials have admitted that on several occasions US H-bombers have, because of errors, set off for the Soviet Union.

There is always the chance—however small—that nuclear weapons might be used accidentally: as a result of false intelligence reports, errors in radar readings, mechanical failures, a mental breakdown, etc., etc., etc.

They might be used deliberately in the later stages of an otherwise non-nuclear war by the side fearing defeat.

Because there is always a chance that the "deterrent" will not in fact prevent the use of these weapons, the last possible justification for their possession disappears.

## Humanicide

A nuclear war would mean the annihilation of at least a major section and possibly all of humanity.

No one has any right to do that, or to pursue a policy which threatens to do that.

The annihilation of humanity is not murder—or war—or even genocide. It is humanicide—exterminating mankind.

Opposition to totalitarianism is no excuse for this supreme crime. There is nothing more totalitarian than annihilating humanity. The next most totalitarian act is to prepare and threaten to do this. Only after these come the Hitler and Stalin regimes.

A tyrannical occupation is terrible. But it is not the end. Life still exists. There is still hope. Freedom will come once more. *Occupation is revocable.*

But the nuclear death of humanity is permanent. Even if a few people were still to exist after the radioactive fury, there would be little hope for their future. *Humanicide is irrevocable.*

Those who say they are opposed to tyranny, but who, instead of learning how to undermine dictatorship, favour preparations to exterminate humanity are guilty on at least four counts:

- They do not believe in the worth of human beings.

really also means the rejection of all weapons of war. What good are tanks against hydrogen bombs?

The alternative to nuclear weapons, then, lies in the non-military sphere. The alternative must be essentially a pacifist policy.

But to favour adopting such a policy today does not require one to be a "pacifist" or to accept all of the pacifist contentions.

There had been a number of proposals for non-violent resistance as a defence policy before Sir Stephen's call, by Cecil Hinshaw in the U.S. and Prof Arne Næss in Norway, for example. And the Dutch "Church and Peace" organisation in 1952 published "A New Road to Defence" (*"Nieuwe Weerbaarheid"*), discussing non-violent resistance as a moral alternative to war.

## What King-Hall did

Far more attention was aroused, however, when a similar proposal was made on the basis of strategic and military grounds by a man with military training and background.

Commander Sir Stephen King-Hall in his original article "Reflections on Defence," his lecture on "The Alternative to the Nuclear Deterrent: Non-violent Resistance" at the Royal United Services Institution, and his book "Defence in the Nuclear Age" has insisted that there should be a serious official enquiry into the

depends to a large extent on the compliance habits of the population. Compliance and enforcement are interdependent . . . " He said: ". . . we could imagine a situation where nobody obeys voluntarily any decision of the totalitarian system, and everybody has to be compelled to obey at pistol point, or under conditions of literally ever-present threat and ever-present supervision."

"This," he continued, ". . . would be prohibitively expensive and, in fact, no government could be carried on on such a basis."\*

That way of defeating tyranny certainly wouldn't be easy, but at least it seems to make more sense than nuclear weapons.

## Invasion?

There is, of course, always the hope that non-violent resistance will not have to be used. An unarmed nation may be far less subject to invasion than if it were armed.

It would be no military threat to others—hence removing fear which is a potent cause of military attack.

It could devote more attention and resources to world-wide human betterment—making friends instead of enemies.

Its courage in breaking with war and

\*Carl J. Friedrich, Editor, "Totalitarianism," Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A., 1954, page 313f.

have done before us in the struggle for justice, freedom and peace, for the principles in which they have believed.

## At least investigate

There are vast problems involved in adopting non-violent resistance as a national defence policy. As Sir Stephen points out, these problems need to be carefully studied. For example: information about the methods must be spread; the population must be trained in their use; the strategy and tactics of NVR under various conditions must be studied and analysed.

There are also social, economic and political corollaries with this method of resistance—just as the military method has its corollaries in these areas.

Despite the desperate situation humanity faces, so far as is known, no government—British, American, Russian, or even Indian—has initiated an official enquiry into non-violent resistance as a defence policy.

Why not?

The leading military officers who attended Sir Stephen's lecture last year at the RUSI were apparently more open-minded than our political leaders.

The idea of a non-violent defence policy has had time to spread. The demand for a full enquiry should be now pressed on all fronts. An enquiry is the least we can expect.



## HIGHLIGHTS OF 1958



The colour question. Left: The struggle of the Negroes of Montgomery, Alabama, against bus segregation was serialised in cartoon form.

Above: Algerian refugees being inoculated against TB in Morocco. The plight of thousands of these refugees and the Algerian War was featured in a special supplement in January.



# End cold war against Russia and China

AMERICA'S Council of Churches, through its Fifth World Order Study Conference held in Cleveland, Ohio, last month, has called for universal disarmament, ending the cold war against Russia and China, and stressed the need for a new positive policy of peacemaking by the Government of the US.

Its findings have been ignored by the world's Press.

Although the 600 present had been addressed by Mr. John Foster Dulles and Thomas K. Finletter, a former Secretary of the US Air Force, they issued an emphatic call for steps to be taken "toward the inclusion of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and for its recognition by our Government."

A representative of the US State Department present at the Conference told John Nevin Sayre of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation that perhaps this emphasis on the need for a policy of peacemaking reflected the groundswell of public dissatisfaction manifested in the recent US elections.

"Whether this be so or not," reports John Nevin Sayre, "there is no question but that those of us at this Conference who were pacifists felt that there was a better Christian perspective and spirit at this gathering than there had been at any previous National Study Conference of the churches since 1942."

I. F. Stone, the American political commentator, has attempted to circumvent the Press silence by reprinting an abridged version of the Conference report at \$3 for 100 or five cents each.

"We believe it deserves the highest praise for courageous application of religious principles, and that it can be a potent weapon in public education for peace," he writes.

## WAR PREVENTION

John Nevin Sayre writes: The dominant ever-present concern of the Conference was work for the prevention of war. Its emphasis was on the promotion of non-military ways of going about this.

The chief steps for this campaign may be summarised as:

1. Relentless effort for universal disarmament.
2. Suspension of nuclear tests under appropriate control and inspection.

3. and other curtains or barriers."
8. Support of the United Nations in every way now open and search for new ways to defend, sustain and enhance it "as a diligent, presently active servant of the world's welfare and as the most ready, best flexed instrument of reconciliation now available to the nations."

This is an impressive list of recommendations, which was carefully elaborated, and there was also emphasis on Human Rights and other concerns, but it has to be said that there is still a long way to go before the recommendations of this Study Conference are accepted and implemented by the churches of the USA.

## STASSEN NOT HEEDED

The proposal to recognise the government of mainland China drew immediate and bitter protest in statements to The New York Times by Dr. Daniel A. Poling, editor of The Christian Herald, Representative Walter H. Judd, member of Congress, Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, The Council Against Communist Aggression, etc.

Around 60 pacifists were present at the Conference and made a genuine contribution to the discussion. We were encouraged by the fact that the gap between pacifists and non-pacifists had greatly narrowed as compared with a few years ago.

Abolition of universal military training was called for and of conscription; and although Harold Stassen and the Steering Committee threw their influence against recommending an end to conscription, they were not sustained in the closing plenary session.

That night Stassen and the Steering Committee worked out a criticism and reformulation of the above statement which next day the Conference adopted by a vote of 139 to 80. The final statement read:

"Members of the Conference agree in categorically rejecting the concept of preventive war.

"There are many of us who emphatic-

## FAMOUS LAST WORDS



"But mate—no one's gonna be mad enough to start an H-bomb war . . ."

—Arthur Horner.

From "Famous Last Words," a cartoon booklet; 2s. from the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, 143 Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.

nuclear warfare in any form must be squarely and prayerfully faced by the churches."

I got the impression that there was pretty

general approval on the part of delegates of the work done in Cleveland, yet all were aware that the conflict between East and West is dangerously acute.

## IN IT ALL IN 1958

IN our first appeal at the beginning of the year we said that Peace News would be "going all out to give the maximum support to the organisations and movements campaigning for a British lead in the field of disarmament and appealing for a sane

We have been the link between movements in different countries, and between different movements in those countries.

We need £384 before our financial year closes on Jan. 31, 1959. Only two more of these fortnightly appeals for the Peace News Fund will be possible. And we have to raise that £384 or start the new year in debt.

May we ask for a special effort now? A





"We believe it deserves the highest praise for courageous application of religious principles, and that it can be a potent weapon in public education for peace," he writes.

## WAR PREVENTION

John Nevin Sayre writes: The dominant ever-present concern of the Conference was work for the prevention of war. Its emphasis was on the promotion of non-military ways of going about this.

The chief steps for this campaign may be summarised as:

1. Relentless effort for universal disarmament.
2. Suspension of nuclear tests under appropriate control and inspection.
3. Abolition of universal military training and conscription.
4. Avoidance of our "posture of general hostility" in the cold war and persistent endeavour by the power of the spirit to turn co-existence into something nearer to mutual aid.
5. Steps toward the inclusion of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and for its recognition by the US.
6. Greatly increased non-military economic aid mutually agreed upon by the recipient and the giver in support of far people's reach for economic fulfilment, spiritual freedom and national justice.
7. Reduction of governmental obstacles to trade and travel "across the iron

by the fact that the gap between pacifists and non-pacifists had greatly narrowed as compared with a few years ago.

**Abolition of universal military training was called for and of conscription; and although Harold Stassen and the Steering Committee threw their influence against recommending an end to conscription, they were not sustained in the closing plenary session.**

That night Stassen and the Steering Committee worked out a criticism and reformulation of the above statement which next day the Conference adopted by a vote of 139 to 80. The final statement read:

"Members of the Conference agree in categorically rejecting the concept of preventive war.

"There are many of us who emphatically do not agree with the inference that deterrence through the capability for nuclear retaliation is to be bracketed with preventive war.


"Such peace as there is today, precarious as it may be, rests to some measure upon that capability. The world's hope of achieving international agreements leading toward universal disarmament may similarly rest in part upon that capability. In expressing these views, it was made clear that this is not to be taken as approval by the Conference of the moral acceptability of all-out nuclear retaliation nor modification of the view of the Conference that the elimination of nuclear war and of war itself is a Christian imperative. The problem of whether or not a Christian can support

nuclear warfare in any form must be squarely and prayerfully faced by the churches."

I got the impression that there was pretty

general approval on the part of delegates of the work done in Cleveland, yet all were aware that the conflict between East and West is dangerously acute.

## IN IT ALL IN 1958



IN our first appeal at the beginning of the year we said that Peace News would be "going all out to give the maximum support to the organisations and movements campaigning for a British lead in the field of disarmament and appealing for a sane

policy in international affairs." We went on to report our plans for covering the voyage of the Golden Rule . . . and to ask our readers to see that we had the money to carry on our work.

What a year it has been: The Central Hall meeting, Aldermaston, Dr. Niemoller's speech to the Peace Pledge Union, the Golden Rule, the Mass Lobby, the March on London, the American and British missile base protests, Algeria, Quemoy, Cyprus, Jordan. . . .

Our telephone, cable and postage bill makes our hair stand on end. Peace News seems to have been in it all—up to the neck.

We have been the link between movements in different countries, and between different movements in those countries.

We need £384 before our financial year closes on Jan. 31, 1959. Only two more of these fortnightly appeals for the Peace News Fund will be possible. And we have to raise that £384 or start the new year in debt.

May we ask for a special effort now? A collection? The hat passed round at your Christmas or New Year Party? One friend who wishes to remain anonymous has sent us a cheque for £100. Are there eight others who would each send us £50 and so bring us to our goal for the year?

We've another year's work ahead.

THE EDITOR.

Contributions since Dec. 5: £126 17s. 0d.

Contributions since Feb. 1, 1958: £1,615 13s. 10d.

Contributions gratefully acknowledged: Anon., Workop, Notts., 10s.

Please make cheques, etc., payable to Lady Clare Annesley, Treasurer, Peace News, 3 Blackstock Road, London, N.4.

## Against the bomb



From left: Dr. Martin Niemöller speaking at the Easter rally at Aldermaston; Michael Scott, member of the Direct Action Committee Against Nuclear War; Bertrand Russell speaking at the Feb. 17 meeting of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament at London's Central Hall; the crew of the Phoenix (Earle Reynolds, his wife and family and Niichi Mikami) arrested inside the H-test area.





# IN PERSPECTIVE

## UNICEF

**T**ODAY the world is so full of unlovely deeds that to concern oneself with only a few of its problems can be a depressing discipline. For some, of course, it is too painful. To those, however, who refuse to abandon their responsibilities, signs of sanity, hope and encouragement are not numerous. One such beacon in an age of darkness unparalleled in history was the decision of the United Nations to establish Specialised Agencies for works of positive construction.

This month sees the twelfth anniversary of the establishment of the Children's Fund. Since its inception UNICEF has changed from an emergency relief organisation, working mainly in war-torn Europe, to a world-wide service developing long-term programmes in the economically under-developed areas.

It has helped throughout the world to equip over 19,000 centres providing basic child health and welfare services. Besides providing milk and essential foods, it is fighting malaria and tuberculosis, leprosy, yaws and blindness in children. The great number of infants who die from malnutrition, privation and disease before their first birthday is being reduced.

In these twelve years well over 1,000,000,000 babies have been born into the world. By 1970 the birth rate will have increased significantly. To meet this situation, UNICEF's annual budget, mainly contributed by 85 governments, is just over £8,000,000, or under half the cost of one new nuclear bomber. The British Government now donates to the Fund £235,000, or less than one-fiftieth of one per cent of its arms budget.

It would not require much faith, vision or sacrifice for many governments to increase their contributions tenfold. Such a decision would help significantly to create the conditions in which peace, justice and happiness could become realities. It could also foster confidence and hope.

But, above all, such an increased contribution is an act which one government could make unilaterally. A decision of this nature could distinguish true statesmanship from blind self-interest, and readily develop into a new con-

ception of international competition—a contest in human nobility. It would be fitting for our children to lead us on this path.

## Berlin blanket

**I**N view of the West's firm refusal of the proposal that West Berlin should be given the status of a free city and that both Russian and Western forces should be withdrawn from their respective zones, last week's NATO meeting in Paris was pretty certainly the most important in the whole life of the organisation.

The joint communiqué issued at the end was exactly what had been expected after the earlier declarations of various Western statesmen, but the situation behind the determined words is full of disagreements. The most striking of these was well depicted in a News Chronicle cartoon on December 16, the first part of which showed a war horse split in three, called European Unity. Mr. Selwyn Lloyd sat on its neck and Chancellor Adenauer and General de Gaulle shared the middle-back; the hindquarters looked as if they might drop or trot off in a different direction, the three warriors' lances threatened one another, and their shields proclaimed their contradictory allegiances: de Gaulle's and Adenauer's "Common Market" and Selwyn Lloyd's "Free Trade Area." The second part of the cartoon showed the same steed with its cut-up body hidden by a big horse blanket inscribed "Berlin Policy," and the three riders and their weapons this time all facing forward.

The Berlin Policy blanket hides the miserable state of European unity, but it does not heal its injuries. To do that, not only NATO but also its complement OEEC—Organisation for European Economic Co-operation—would have to contribute health-giving strength. But the fact is that neither NATO, the militaristic ingredient, nor OEEC, the economic one, is fit to furnish anything but elements of weakness, as far as true solidarity is concerned.

## Western disunity

**O**EEC consists of seventeen members, eleven of whom, headed by Britain, stand for a free trade area plan firmly opposed by the other six, headed by France, whose common market will come into operation on Jan. 1, 1959, when there will be something like a trade war between the two sides.

Last week's efforts in Paris to find a way of putting off

# PEACE NEWS

The International Pacifist Weekly

Editorial and Publishing office:

3 Blackstock Road, London, N.4

Tel: STAMford Hill 2262

Distribution office for U.S.A.:

20 S. Twelfth Street, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

Registered as a newspaper. Second class postage paid at Philadelphia, Pa.

the fatal day have failed, and there will not even be a further meeting between the opposing camps before Jan. 15. "Opposed" in the above sentence is not quite the correct term, since all parties profess anxiety to reconcile the two plans. But as they are irreconcilable in their present shapes, it nevertheless does justice to the situation. Let us add only that it is one which gives Moscow more ground for enjoyment than it gives to the West.

As for NATO there, too, there are internal disagreements. General de Gaulle, as was to be expected from him, wants a triumvirate of leaders—USA, Britain and France—and general recognition of France's greatness. He also has reservations concerning the use of nuclear weapons. He is not content to leave a decision regarding their use to "others" and wants to bargain authority for establishing missile sites on French soil against means of having a stock of his own of nuclear weapons.

Other members, too, of NATO are holding out their hands for these things with the result that a most unfortunate alternative will have to be faced before long: either their will be growing jealousy between those who are not given nuclear armaments and those who have them, or there will be a wide distribution, including to Portugal and even to Spain, of the most devastating engines of destruction.

It would be interesting to know how many people in Britain feel happy about the association of their country, in the name of freedom and respect for the individual, with the two dictatorships of General Franco and Dr. Salazar even before the prospect of their access to nuclear weapons has become an early probability—to say nothing of afterwards.

# CAMPAIGNING IN NINETEEN-FIFTY-EIGHT

**T**HE PAST YEAR HAS BEEN MARKED by a growing realisation of the terrible power for self-destruction that mankind is developing.

Intensified efforts have been made, by those who refuse to be inhibited by psychological defence mechanisms, to awaken the public to the realities of the situation in which they so precariously continue to exist.

In Britain there has been the great series of meetings organised by the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament; the striking march to Aldermaston, with the later protracted picket period there; other protest marches in various parts of the country; and now non-violent obstruction at the North Pickenham rocket base.

There has been greatly increased activity elsewhere also, notably the attempt by the American crew of the "Golden Rule" to sail to the Pacific testing area.

Perhaps the most encouraging aspect in Britain of all these activities has been the public reaction. It would, of course, be absurd to say that there had been general approval, although there may be a rider against this, but the reaction was

**I**N THIS SITUATION there is a division of opinion in the British pacifist movement, but the division is not basic.

There is no disagreement that it is war in its totality that has to be renounced, that the way to do this is to abandon the weapons of war unilaterally. The question now is how best to make an impact on the increasing number of people who are ready to consider the need to abandon old assumptions regarding military preparation.

● Some maintain that people who are ready to consider the renunciation of nuclear arms can be led, by pacifists campaigning with them, to realise that they will need to renounce all arms.

● Others hold that, in an age of new weapons when there must be growing doubts as to the validity of traditional defence assumptions, the pacifist should accept these doubts as providing favourable conditions to continue steadfastly his consistent challenge



# CAMPAIGNING IN NINETEEN-FIFTY-EIGHT

**THE PAST YEAR HAS BEEN MARKED** by a growing realisation of the terrible power for self-destruction that mankind is developing.

Intensified efforts have been made, by those who refuse to be inhibited by psychological defence mechanisms, to awaken the public to the realities of the situation in which they so precariously continue to exist.

In Britain there has been the great series of meetings organised by the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament; the striking march to Aldermaston, with the later protracted picket period there; other protest marches in various parts of the country; and now non-violent obstruction at the North Pickenham rocket base.

There has been greatly increased activity elsewhere also, notably the attempt by the American crew of the "Golden Rule" to sail to the Pacific testing area.

Perhaps the most encouraging aspect in Britain of all these activities has been the public reaction. It would, of course, be absurd to say that there had been general approval, although there may be a wider quiet endorsement than is realised. The really significant thing has been the sober reaction of the public—and even of the Press.

Both political parties, however, are agreed in committing themselves to the policies against which these activities are levelled, and whichever Party wins the forthcoming General Election, it will assume an overwhelming support for its policy of nuclear armament.

Yet the spiteful reactions to early activities of the pacifist movement have not greeted the provocative demonstrations against present policy. Today, even when people endorse the Government policy, they know they are being taken along a path of appalling risk.

**THERE ARE VERY FEW WHO CAN FEEL ANY REAL CONVICTION THAT THE GAMBLE THEY HAVE SUPPORTED WILL NOT BRING DISASTER.**

In such a situation their doubts are renewed and emphasised by the activities of the concerned few who insist on keeping this matter before them. They are forced to consider the moral aspects of the policy in which they are acquiescing.



**IN THIS SITUATION** there is a division of opinion in the British pacifist movement, but the division is not basic.

There is no disagreement that it is war in its totality that has to be renounced, that the way to do this is to abandon the weapons of war unilaterally. The question now is how best to make an impact on the increasing number of people who are ready to consider the need to abandon old assumptions regarding military preparation.

● Some maintain that people who are ready to consider the renunciation of nuclear arms can be led, by pacifists campaigning with them, to realise that they will need to renounce all arms.

● Others hold that, in an age of new weapons when there must be growing doubts as to the validity of traditional defence assumptions, the pacifist should accept these doubts ■ providing favourable conditions to continue steadfastly his consistent challenge to those traditional assumptions.

**THE DIVISION AMONG PACIFISTS** cannot have permanent significance, and the coming year may possibly see the end of it.

The first impetus of the great general nuclear disarmament campaign is unfortunately not being maintained, although those concerned with direct action are keeping the issue alive remarkably successfully.

It now remains to be seen whether the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament is sufficiently single-minded in the matter to find a way of making its cause an important issue in the 1959 General Election. If it cannot do this, there will be no possibility of reviving the Campaign subsequently on its earlier basis.

The future work for a unilateral approach to disarmament will then fall back wholly on the pacifists, with the support of the nuclear disarmament direct actionists.

**IT IS POSSIBLE THAT 1959 MAY SEE THESE IN FULL ALLIANCE.**

## Marches North and South



Above: The march from London to Aldermaston at Easter. Five thousand rallied in a field near the Atomic Weapons Research Establishment to protest against nuclear weapons. Below: The ten-day Coast to Coast March from Withernsea to Liverpool.



## TWO OF HIS FRIENDS WRITE ABOUT

## Reginald Reynolds

As briefly reported in Peace News last week, Reginald Reynolds, writer, Quaker peace worker and a director of Peace News, died in Adelaide, Australia, on December 16. He was 53.

REG REYNOLDS dead! It is the hardest thing to believe. He was often sick, tired, pale, and yet one felt he would always be there; and everyone else thought so, too, for he always was there, however pressed with work, friendly and ready to meet and greet admirers, scroungers, hangers-on, anarchists and Conservatives, atheists and Christians.

And just before he left on this, the last of his many travels, to Australia, he rounded up as many of his friends as he could, to have a meal or a coffee or a chat, though he could easily and perhaps more wisely have had some time alone, to write or reflect.

For when he was not entertaining his friends he was usually talking or writing planning work thinking how to express all he believed. By his side there was the inevitable brief case, bulging with notes, papers, work waiting to be done, work half done, work ready for the publishers, work to be looked at again because he was not satisfied with it. And at some point in every conversation he would dip into the bag and bring out a card, or find one in his pocket, with notes all over it so that you wondered whether he could ever find the note he needed; but all he wanted was to add another note about something you had asked him, or something he wanted to remember, or some reference he wanted to check.

what violent anti-imperialist; he became a pacifist, but saw his pacifism as a protest against imperialism, which he regarded as the prime cause of war. We had arguments galore in the No More War Movement (I was a victim of some withering comment on more than one occasion), but we made him Secretary of it nevertheless.

He moved over to a hope that the workers would stop war by a policy of general strike—but he moved further to the realisation that workers without inner conviction would not stop war; and John Woolman was his model of a man with inner conviction, deeply and truly religious.

That was what Reg. became. He was a Quaker with a tendency to dissent, and some of the so-respectable members of the Society of Friends drove him to distraction;

## Memorial meeting

A memorial meeting for Reginald Reynolds will be held in the Small Friends Meeting House, Euston Road, London, on Thursday, Jan. 1, at 6 p.m.

tion; but he became an ardent worker for that Society, developing the work-camp idea (and of course taking part himself), propagating and demonstrating the true gospel but never claiming or admitting to himself that he was a preacher, or religious, or anything but an ordinary man trying to do what seemed to be the immediate, essential, practical thing. He grew more and more impatient with movements, policies, organisations, long-term views; he got on with what he felt needed to be done.

He disappeared into Africa for a year to emerge with wonderful stories of progress by the coloured people and terrible stories of continued oppression by their white masters; in Devonshire he refused to pay



## REMINDER

A REFUGEE  
CHILD WAITS  
FOR YOUR  
ANSWER

PLEASE RESPOND GENEROUSLY  
TO LORD BIRKETT'S B.B.C. APPEAL



"If you have been blessed with home and friends and Christmas fare, think of those refugees who have none of these things, and for whom every day means cold and hunger and, perhaps illness, in a dismal camp. Then send all the help you can, and remember that even the smallest gift will help someone."

10/- will feed an undernourished refugee boy for one month. £5 maintains four limbless children for a week.

Please send to: Lord Birkett, 17 Broad Street, Oxford

Please Send  
Your Gift  
Now



OXFORD COMMITTEE FOR  
FAMINE RELIEF

(Regd. War Charities Act, 1940)

SUPPORTERS INCLUDE:—Vera Brittain, Laurence Housman,  
The Very Rev. George F. MacLeod, Dame Sybil Thorndike.

I FIRST came to know Reginald Reynolds in the early 1930s through casual contacts made in Independent Labour Party Circles. Then, in 1932, after an upheaval in the No More War Movement, he was brought in to act as Secretary, with the late Robert Entwistle as Organiser. Since that time I have had continuous association with Reg. in one way or another, and, as many others must have done, I have not only enjoyed his friendship but have been a constant gainer from contact with his active

sional book or pamphlet. In all this activity Reg was outstanding for his fecundity in ideas and his capacity for critical analysis. All concerned gained from their association with him.

Reginald Reynolds has left a notable contribution to literature in a number of different fields. His indifferent health over many years has handicapped him here



ready for the publishers, work to be looked at again because he was not satisfied with it. And at some point in every conversation he would dip into the bag and bring out a card, or find one in his pocket, with notes all over it so that you wondered whether he could ever find the note he needed; but all he wanted was to add another note about something you had asked him, or something he wanted to remember, or some reference he wanted to check.

that Society, developing the work-camp idea (and of course taking part himself), propagating and demonstrating the true gospel but never claiming or admitting to himself that he was a preacher, or religious, or anything but an ordinary man trying to do what seemed to be the immediate, essential, practical thing. He grew more and more impatient with movements, policies, organisations, long-term views; he got on with what he felt needed to be done.

He disappeared into Africa for a year to emerge with wonderful stories of progress by the coloured people and terrible stories of continued oppression by their white masters; in Devonshire he refused to pay a fine for some trifling cycling offence so that he could go to prison for a few days to see for himself what it was like. As the result of this he became a more ardent penal reformer, and he and Ethel Mannin became firm friends of the prison governor. That was a normal thing. Wherever he went he made friends, because he was a friend.

Our sympathies will be with Ethel Mannin in her loss of a gay and humorous companion; but our sympathy is with the whole of humanity in its loss of a champion and universal friend. No words can portray Reginald Reynolds, and anyhow he would not wish us to try to say any more—as I write this, they are singing the Hallelujah Chorus on the radio; it seems appropriate.

**Frank Dawtry**

**SUPPORTERS INCLUDE:**—Vera Brittain, Laurence Housman, The Very Rev. George F. MacLeod, Dame Sybil Thorndike.

I FIRST came to know Reginald Reynolds in the early 1930s through casual contacts made in Independent Labour Party Circles. Then, in 1932, after an upheaval in the No More War Movement, he was brought in to act as Secretary, with the late Robert Entwistle as Organiser. Since that time I have had continuous association with Reg. in one way or another, and, as many others must have done, I have not only enjoyed his friendship but have been a constant gainer from contact with his active and brilliant intellect.

The period of Reginald Reynolds' secretaryship of the No More War Movement was one in which much thinking was done on the implications of pacifist policy. Those of us who then formed its National Executive became a very close working team and a group of friends; so much so that when the No More War Movement was dissolved so that its membership could be transferred to the Peace Pledge Union those who had formed the executive kept together as a "Pacifist Research Bureau" so that we could continue to meet, have our policy discussions, and publish an occa-

sional book or pamphlet. In all this activity Reg was outstanding for his fecundity in ideas and his capacity for critical analysis. All concerned gained from their association with him.

Reginald Reynolds has left a notable contribution to literature in a number of different fields. His indifferent health over many years has handicapped him here. There has always seemed to me to be much evidence in his writing of the kind of brilliance which, given a more robust constitution and a longer life, could have made of him one of Britain's outstanding literary figures.

Reg. had a great capacity for friendship, and he had hosts of friends in the most diverse circles. Not only Peace News, the Pacifist Movement and those concerned in other causes to which he gave his help, but his many friends also will be conscious of a great loss in the realisation that they will not again benefit from the light shed by his brilliant intelligence, his gift for lucid exposition, his wit and his sense of fun.

**Allen Skinner**

## PPU CANCELLATION

The London Area PPU Meeting on Dec. 30 will not take place.

## CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE



Two dramatic American actions against the bomb. Above: the Golden Rule's attempted voyage into the Pacific testing area in February. Right: non-violent obstruction at Cheyenne rocket site (see "On Non-violent Obstruction," page six).





# ON NON-VIOLENT OBSTRUCTION

By Bradford Lyttle

*Associate Peace Secretary in Chicago of the American Friends Service Committee.*

**DURING** the summer a group of pacifists and pacifist sympathisers demonstrated against the Atlas inter-continental ballistics missile base site being constructed near Cheyenne, Wyoming. Five demonstrators were imprisoned for trespassing during demonstrations conducted at missile launching site A, the first site under construction. One of these people, Kenneth Calkins, was struck by a truck while sitting in the gateway to the site. Before being sentenced to jail, he was hospitalised for ten days.

The Cheyenne demonstrations have raised important theoretical questions concerning the use of non-violent resistance. They have given rise to a new distinction, that of a difference between *civil disobedience*, the violation of a law in course of a non-violent demonstration, and *non-violent obstruction*, the non-violent physical obstruction of actions one believes to be morally wrong.

The distinction arose partly because of the peculiar physical location of the missile site at which the demonstrations took place. Site A is an enclave. The land for the site is owned by the government, and construction companies working on the site have been granted access to it by the private parties owning the surrounding territory. People wishing to demonstrate at the site therefore were compelled to pass over private land at the risk of violating a trespassing law (civil disobedience).

Trucks enter the government property through gates in the surrounding fence. Some demonstrators non-violently obstructed the passage of trucks and other equipment by standing, sitting or lying in the gateway or on the road leading to it. Such obstruction was termed non-violent obstruction.

## Arguments against

There was agreement among participants in the project that civil disobedience was justified and within the moral right of the demonstrators. Civil disobedience involved no obstruction and usually trespassing occurred because a demonstrator wished to exercise the democratic right of distributing leaflets or talking to construction workers.

However, differences of opinion arose regarding the use of non-violent obstruction.

The use of this technique was criticised on several main grounds. One is that obstructing the passage of equipment and harassing the construction workers, even by

under these circumstances demonstrators have the right to appeal verbally to the workers but no right to harass or obstruct them.

Other arguments raised against non-violent obstruction were that the technique can be misinterpreted easily by the public, tends to support an unfavourable image of the demonstrators, and tends to create public hostility. The public, it is argued, sees the technique as obstruction only and misses the moral reasons behind it.

## Moral imperative

Let us look at these arguments more carefully:

*Infringement upon the rights of the workers.*

Here is a possible hypothetical situation: If you see a man beating a woman or child with a club, has he the moral right to continue unobstructed? Do you have no moral right non-violently to prevent his action?

Clearly, to me, the most responsible behaviour would be to use every non-violent means at your disposal to stop the beating, even if this meant interposing your body between the attacker and his victim, and taking the blows on yourself.

This is much the situation at the missile base. The truck and equipment drivers are constructing a ghastly weapon that can cremate alive millions of innocent human beings. They may believe that they are morally right in building the base; they may need the wages they earn to support their families. Nevertheless, I can see a moral imperative for *obstructing* their work by every moral, non-violent means available. Do not the lives of 10,000,000 men, women and children threatened by the base make non-violent obstruction a responsible policy?

The true principle seems to me to be this: that everyone has the moral right to

cratic process is a valuable political technique and tradition but if the will of the majority is to do evil, it becomes the moral duty of the minority who sees what is right to oppose that will. I respect the democratic process whether or not it is in its proper place in relation to conscience and moral law. But respect for the *process* does not entail giving priority to its *results* rather than priority to conscience. In Cheyenne, a result of this process is the construction of a missile base which can cremate alive millions of innocent people.

## Cheyenne hostility

*Generation of hostility.* An increase in immediate public hostility should not bring panicky abandonment of a tremendously powerful educational tool

Many pacifist leaders felt that the great hostility and misunderstanding produced in Cheyenne by the use of non-violent obstruction was hurting the pacifist movement and should not be used. I wonder if these leaders, who wish to discard an educational technique because it produces hostility, remember, or have read, George Fox's *Journal*, or *At the Feet of the Mahatma* by Rajendra Prasad. Fox and his fellow "ministers of truth" barely survived the beatings they endured in their proselytising. Hundreds of Indians were shot by the British in the Amritsar, Jallianwalla Bagh massacre.

Gandhi never suspended civil disobedience or discarded an educational technique because it produced hostility. He stopped only when hostility or violence crept into the action of his followers. Gandhi judged the non-violence of his educational techniques before he employed them. He did not use a technique, then judge its non-violence by the effect it produced.

I believe that the hostility at Cheyenne was produced by the exceptional power of the educational technique of non-violent obstruction. At this point it seems to me valuable to explore the possible sources of this power.

Non-violent obstruction dramatises the importance of the issue. Most missile site construction workers probably see little more than a weekly pay check in their work. It is doubtful that they fully understand the arguments used by opponents to the base. You can dismiss a man who hands you a leaflet without taking him

if he sits down before your truck. He is either crazy or motivated by something very important to him.

## Act of atonement

Non-violent obstruction makes real to the construction workers the issues symbolised by the missile base. A construction worker and the public may regard a missile base as a new source of income for the locality, a glamorous toy. Actually, a missile can cremate alive 3,000,000 people and pulverise the largest city.

The realities of death are excluded from an American city, but a non-violent resister sitting in front of a truck raises these realities to public consciousness. The truck driver finds himself faced with the choice of running over the man and killing him or stopping and dragging him out of the way. The idea of murder is not normally associated with the missile base for him. Now it is. He sees a man sitting in the dust before his truck who is silently saying to him, "Kill me before you build this missile base; kill me before you help kill a million innocent people."

**Non-violent obstruction raises the moral issue of murder, the reality of death.**

To a Christian or theist, non-violent obstruction can be interpreted as an act of atonement. In this interpretation, the changes in the minds of construction workers that would lead them to give up work on the base would be wrought by God. The resister prays: "Lord, I offer to you my life that this hideous weapon of death may not be built. I will risk death so that these construction workers and the American people in general may be redeemed from their wicked design."

*Misinterpretation of the technique.* Pacifists have long been articulate with tongue, typewriter and mimeograph. It isn't misinterpretation from which their cause suffers most; it is from not being listened to. Before non-violent obstruction was used at Cheyenne the project was ignored. All the releases and leaflets made little dent on public apathy.

**Non-violent obstruction shattered the apathy, local and national. Many of the people of Cheyenne may have been made hostile; they were also made aware.**

Elements of the situation are similar to those which caused the British general



obstruction.

## Arguments against

There was agreement among participants in the project that civil disobedience was justified and within the moral right of the demonstrators. Civil disobedience involved no obstruction and usually trespassing occurred because a demonstrator wished to exercise the democratic right of distributing leaflets or talking to construction workers.

However, differences of opinion arose regarding the use of non-violent obstruction.

The use of this technique was criticised on several main grounds. One is that obstructing the passage of equipment and harassing the construction workers, even by non-violent methods, involves infringing upon their rights to do what they see to be their right and duty. The demonstrators believe that it is morally wrong to build missile sites. The construction workers believe that it is right—missiles are needed for national defence. Those who argue against non-violent obstruction say that

body between the attacker and his victim, and taking the blows on yourself.

This is much the situation at the missile base. The truck and equipment drivers are constructing a ghastly weapon that can cremate alive millions of innocent human beings. They may believe that they are morally right in building the base; they may need the wages they earn to support their families. Nevertheless, I can see a moral imperative for *obstructing* their work by every moral, non-violent means available. Do not the lives of 10,000,000 men, women and children threatened by the base make non-violent obstruction a responsible policy?

The true principle seems to me to be this: that everyone has the moral right to try and frustrate what he regards as evil by means which are not bad in themselves.

*Violation of the democratic process.* Those who use this argument have forgotten, or never read, Thoreau's essay "On Civil Disobedience." An act of a majority should never *bind* a minority. The demo-

the non-violence of his educational techniques before he employed them. He did not use a technique, then judge its non-violence by the effect it produced.

I believe that the hostility at Cheyenne was produced by the exceptional power of the educational technique of non-violent obstruction. At this point it seems to me valuable to explore the possible sources of this power.

Non-violent obstruction dramatises the importance of the issue. Most missile site construction workers probably see little more than a weekly pay check in their work. It is doubtful that they fully understand the arguments used by opponents to the base. You can dismiss a man who hands you a leaflet without taking him seriously. It is very difficult to dismiss him

so that these construction workers and the American people in general may be redeemed from their wicked design."

*Misinterpretation of the technique.* Pacifists have long been articulate with tongue, typewriter and mimeograph. It isn't misinterpretation from which their cause suffers most; it is from not being listened to. Before non-violent obstruction was used at Cheyenne the project was ignored. All the releases and leaflets made little dent on public apathy.

**Non-violent obstruction shattered the apathy, local and national. Many of the people of Cheyenne may have been made hostile; they were also made aware.**

Elements of the situation are similar to those which caused the British general

★ ON PAGE SEVEN

## THOUSANDS AT THE RALLIES



Two of the year's great rallies: A sea of faces in Trafalgar Square as 6,000 people assemble after the March on London. Right: 150,000 people in Hamburg demonstrate against the bomb.





## DIARY

**Saturday, December 27**  
ALTON: "Hillcrest," Windmill Hill, Christmas Party. Young Peaceseekers.

**Sunday, December 28**  
LONDON, W.C.1: 3.30 p.m. 32 Tavistock Sq., Euston. Christmas Service. Universal Centre and PPU Religion Commission.

**Wednesday, December 31**  
LONDON, N.W.1: 6.30 p.m. Friends Ho., Euston Rd., "Peace Forum." Questions and discussion with Panel from Standing Joint Pacifist Committee.

**Thursday, January 1**  
LONDON, E.11: 8 p.m. Friends Mtg. Ho., Bush Rd. Duncan Watson "Germany Rediscovered." PPU.

**Thursday, January 8**  
LONDON, E.11: 8 p.m. Friends Mtg. Ho., Bush Rd. Group AGM. PPU.

**Friday, January 9**  
HUDDERSFIELD: 7.30 p.m. New North Rd., Baptist Schoolroom. Prof. J. Rotblatt, John Braine. Chair., Cllr. E. L. Thackray. CND.

## TO ALL STUDENTS

Combined Universities Conference

on **NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT**

Jan. 1-4 Conway Hall Holborn W.C.1.

**SIR STEPHEN KING-HALL**

Downing Street Delegation

Hyde Park Platform

N.D. Cellar Party

Apply: CUCaND

77d Southwark Bridge Road, S.E.1.

COMMONSENSE WAYS

TO BETTER

HEALTH

IN

# Fitness

THE NEW

LIVELY MAGAZINE

THAT WILL KEEP YOU ALIVE

Recent contributors include: Stanley Matthews, the Bedser Twins, Freddie Mills, Erica Batchelor, etc. Regular articles on Fitness Secrets of the Stars, Fitness for Marriage, Figure Fitness, and articles by Doris Grant, Dr. C. V. Pink and Newman Turner.

**SPECIAL INTRODUCTORY OFFER**

15s. per annum post free (thereafter 22s. p.a.)

Published monthly by

NEWMAN TURNER PUBLICATIONS, LTD.,  
Deanrow Letchworth Herts.

# A plan to destroy Apartheid

By **FENNER BROCKWAY MP**

Chairman, Movement for Colonial Freedom



WE approach the New Year. I anticipate that the Union of South Africa will loom large in the world's news before 1960 comes. From three sources the pressure of events will come: 1, the United Nations; 2, the African peoples outside the Union; and 3, the Union itself.

The Union Government has defied the United Nations year after year over South West Africa. It has taken no notice whatsoever of the Assembly's view that the old League of Nations mandate should be inherited. Only South Africa among the mandatory Powers has refused. It has absorbed South West Africa despite United Nations' condemnation. How long will this defiance be tolerated?

I think it likely we shall see in the coming year serious proposals for United Nations' action. They will probably originate from the Afro-Asian group of nations.

An unexpected recruit may join them before long. The United States of America. We are not paying sufficient attention to what is happening in America. The Democrats are sweeping away Republican power. When the presidential election comes we shall almost certainly see a Democrat occupying the White House.

## Spiritual revolution

I have often found it difficult to distinguish between the Democratic and Republican parties. But on the issue of race relations there is a real difference in intensity of feeling and determination to act. Don't underestimate what Republican President Eisenhower has done. He has been courageous, particularly at Little Rock. There is the contradiction that in the racist Southern States the Democrats are the tyrants of American apartheid.

But there has been something like a spiritual revolution in the Democratic

America and Britain, with all their dislike of South African policies, support this action? I am very sceptical.

What of the second source of pressure—the African peoples outside the Union? Their attitude was reflected at the Accra Conference where the decision was taken to boycott goods from the Union. This policy will take a long time to organise and its effectiveness will be limited. Africans do not buy minerals.

The gesture of solidarity was splendid, but in truth, Africans outside South Africa will exert a greater influence on changes in the Union by their own example of political and economic advance than by a necessarily restricted economic boycott.

A boycott might help, however, if it were applied outside the Union to African-consumed goods which Africans within the Union had first themselves decided not to buy because of their apartheid origin.

## Pressure from within

Pressure from within South Africa? This will grow and become overwhelming. The whites are dependent on the Africans, their gold, diamonds, uranium depend on them. Practically all manual labour in the Union, whether in industry or on the farms, is done by African labour. I have no doubt that the Africans will proceed by a series of resistances, attempted, crushed, attempted again and again until they become nationwide and sustained. The African people, with the whole-hearted co-operation of the Indian and coloured populations will, because history is on their side, eventually emancipate themselves.

I fear there will be much suffering before that day comes.

Are we—we in Britain, the United Nations—to leave them to it? No. There is one positive action not so far mentioned.

I am convinced that the key to what happened in South Africa lies in the

PEACE NEWS—December 26, 1958—7

## CLASSIFIED

**TERMS:** Cash with order, 3d. per word, min. 2s. 6d. (Box No. 1s. extra). Please don't send stamps in payment, except for odd pence. Address for Box No. replies: Peace News, 3 Blackstock Rd., London, N.4.

### HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION

A VEGETARIAN GUEST HOUSE in the heart of the Lake District, Rothay Bank, Grasmere, Westmorland, offers comfortable rooms and expertly planned meals, attention to those requiring rest as well as facilities for walkers, climbers, motorists. Large garden with views of fells.—Isabel James, Telephone: Grasmere 334.

### ACCOMMODATION

HOMELY ACCOMMODATION and jolly good food for visitors and permanent guests. CANONBURY 1340, Telkeas Shaylor, 27 Hamilton Pk., N.5.

TO LET—CHARMING 3 room flat, bath, unfurnished/part furnished. Newly decorated. Quiet house. 4 guineas weekly. Near Lewisham Station and Heath. LEE 9560.

### PERSONAL

GOING ABROAD? Maintain, advocate and urge liberty of freedom to travel without vaccination, invoke Clause 83 International Sanitary Regulations. Enquire, and/or send donation, National Anti-Vaccination League, 2nd Floor, 26/28 Warwick Way, London, S.W.1.

SPEAKING AND WRITING lessons (correspondence, visit), 5s. Dorothy Matthews, BA, 32 Primrose Hill Rd., London, N.W.3. PRImrose 5686.

WAR RESISTERS' International welcomes gifts of foreign stamps and undamaged air mail covers. Please send to WRI, 88 Park Ave., Enfield, Middx.

WE INVITE ENQUIRIES about our work for international friendships. S.A.E. details, "Caravan" (PN), 84 St. Thomas's Rd., London, N.4.

YOUNG MAN, AMERICAN, 25, Vegetarian-Pacifist; good-natured and intelligent; desires correspondence with young lady of similar views, preferably in America, with view to marriage. Box 804.

### LITERATURE

BRITAIN'S OLDEST SOCIALIST WEEKLY—a vigorous, forthright and consistently against war—the "Socialist Leader." Indispensable to members of the PPU who want up-to-date information of home and world politics. Threepence weekly. Obtainable from your newsagent or from 48 Dundas St., Glasgow, C.1, and 6 Endsleigh St., London, W.C.1.

CONTACT—a South African Liberal fortnightly with inside news of the struggle against apartheid and colonialism. 6 months 12s., 12 months £1 3s. 6d. Box 1979, Cape Town, South Africa.

"LIBERTE," the French pacifist weekly 36s. a year, 20s. 6 months. (US \$5 seemail, \$10 airmail, a year) from Housemans (Peace News bookshop), 3 Blackstock Rd., London, N.4.

QUAKERISM. Information and literature respecting the Faith and Practice of the Religious Society of Friends, free on application to Friends' Home Service Ctee., Friends House, Euston Rd., London N.W.1.

### FOR SALE

PEACE DIARY for 1959 now available, with 32 page World Directory of Peace Organisations and Periodicals, 3s. 6d. (postage 4d.) from Endsleigh Cards (Peace News Ltd.), 3 Blackstock Road, London, N.4. (Full Christmas List available).

### SITUATIONS VACANT

PEACE NEWS OFFICE IS OPEN up to 9 p.m. every Wednesday evening for the sale of books and stationery, and for voluntary help with the despatch of Peace News. Visitors welcomed. (Mon. to Fri. 8.30 a.m. to 5.30 p.m.) 3 Blackstock Rd. (above Fish and Cook, stationers). Finsbury Park (near sta.), N.4.

Bradford Lyttle

★ FROM PAGE ONE

strike of 1929 to fail. Fenner Brockway, in



# Fitness

## THE NEW LIVELY MAGAZINE THAT WILL KEEP YOU ALIVE

Recent contributors include: Stanley Matthews, the Bedser Twins, Freddie Mills, Erica Batchelor, etc. Regular articles on Fitness Secrets of the Stars, Fitness for Marriage, Figure Fitness, and articles by Doris Grant, Dr. C. V. Pink and Newman Turner.

### SPECIAL INTRODUCTORY OFFER

15s. per annum post free (thereafter 22s. p.a.)

Published monthly by

NEWMAN TURNER PUBLICATIONS, LTD.,  
Deanrow Letchworth Herts.



## BUILD YOUR FUTURE

Wisely • Safely  
Let Your Money Earn

**4%** FREE OF  
INCOME TAX

Interest accrues from date of  
investment

"Guide for Investors" sent  
on request

**ST. PANCRAS  
BUILDING SOCIETY**

For Social Saving

Total assets exceed £2,000,000

200, Finchley Road, London, N.W.3

## Spiritual revolution

I have often found it difficult to distinguish between the Democratic and Republican parties. But on the issue of race relations there is a real difference in intensity of feeling and determination to act. don't underestimate what Republican President Eisenhower has done. He has been courageous, particularly at Little Rock. There is the contradiction that in the racist Southern States the Democrats are the tyrants of American apartheid.

But there has been something like a spiritual revolution in the Democratic Party. It is ready to lose the Southern Democrats rather than sacrifice the principle of human equality. They may be expected to be bold within America—and in the United Nations.

There are two other factors which assist this tendency. America was a British colony and won its independence from Britain. The sentiment of anti-colonialism is therefore naturally strong among its people. The second factor is the growing realisation in America that the claims of colonial peoples to independence and to economic opportunities, allowing release from primitive poverty, must be championed by the West if Communist influence is not to spread.

A more courageous United Nations could mobilise the massive pressure of world opinion. This would immensely encourage the African, Indian and Coloured populations of South Africa, but it might not prove enough. The United Nations could expel the Union of South Africa. But if South Africa, why not Hungary? The implications of that would include the destruction of the United Nations as an international organisation by the withdrawal of the Communist countries.

## Economic sanctions

A third alternative would be the imposition of economic sanctions against South Africa. There are two doubts about this. The first is its effect on the very peoples in South Africa whom we wish to support. They would be thrown out of work and go hungry. I am assured that they would face this because hunger is already their companion, but I feel very unwilling to advocate a course which imposes all the suffering on others.

The second doubt arises from the value of the diamonds, the gold and the uranium which America, Britain and other countries, in one case or another, import. Would

whether in industry or on the farms, is done by African labour. I have no doubt that the Africans will proceed by a series of resistances, attempted, crushed, attempted again and again until they become nationwide and sustained. The African people, with the whole-hearted co-operation of the Indian and coloured populations will, because history is on their side, eventually emancipate themselves.

I fear there will be much suffering before that day comes.

Are we—we in Britain, the United Nations—to leave them to it? No. There is one positive action not so far mentioned.

I am convinced that the key to what happened in South Africa lies in the British Protectorates. They can be the Union's trump card. They can be our trump card.

## Something practical

They can be the Union's trump card because thousands of workers in the Protectorates have to go to the Johannesburg mines to earn a livelihood. The Union could exclude them and, unless we do something big about it, starve the territories into submission and acceptance of absorption. They are our trump card because minerals are now being found in the Protectorates which, if developed, could form a growing alternative to Johannesburg, and enable these territories to become self-reliant, self-supporting States.

Does Britain, do the United Nations, want to do something practical? The answer would be a vast fund for the economic development of the Protectorates, both industrial and agricultural, accompanied by technical assistance, with associated housing schemes, schools, hospitals, which would be a model for a new African society.

Even if the Union Government acted quickly, employment would be provided in the beginnings of this plan, and the economic aid should be made enough to provide exemplary wages.

An imaginative, constructive scheme of this character would be the best answer to South Africa's outrage to human dignity. If, parallel with this economic revolution, we established legislatures elected democratically on a basis of equality between whites, Africans and Indians—as we can rapidly in Bechuanaland and Basutoland, at least—we could destroy apartheid in its very citadel, in South Africa itself.

Copyright reserved to author in India and Africa.

Friends, free on application to Friends' Home Service Ctee., Friends House, Euston Rd., London N.W.1.

### FOR SALE

PEACE DIARY for 1959 now available, with 32 page World Directory of Peace Organisations and Periodicals, 3s. 6d. (postage 4d.) from Endsleigh Cards (Peace News Ltd.), 3 Blackstock Road, London, N.4. (Full Christmas List available).

### SITUATIONS VACANT

PEACE NEWS OFFICE IS OPEN up to 9 p.m. every Wednesday evening for the sale of books and stationery, and for voluntary help with the despatch of Peace News. Visitors welcomed. (Mon. to Fri. 8.30 a.m. to 5.30 p.m.) 3 Blackstock Rd. (above Fish and Cook, stationers). Finsbury Park (near sta.), N.4.

## Bradford Lyttle

### ★ FROM PAGE ONE

strike of 1929 to fail. Fenner Brockway, in his brilliant history *Inside the Left*, says that the strike failed because Britain's labour leaders did not really believe in their slogans of Socialist revolution and became fearful when the immense non-violent power of their strike brought national political power within their grasp. It would sadden me greatly to think that leaders of the pacifist movement were equally uncertain of their professed intentions, equally timid in the use of their non-violent weapons.

One sponsor of the Golden Rule told me that participants in non-violent action projects were confident that the odds heavily favoured their escape without injury. I consider participation under such persuasion unrealistic and unwise. At Cheyenne, my constant admonition to demonstrators was, "If you sit in front of trucks you face death." Before Ken Calkins' injury no one seemed to agree with me.

Much of the weakness of the peace movement is due to anaemia caused by too much middle-class prudence, too little imagination and resolute action. We must think and act on the assumption that we can bring about a non-violent revolution against the tradition of military power.—*Courtesy Liberation.*

### PEACE NEWS STANDARD RATES

3 Blackstock Rd., London, N.4  
Great Britain and Abroad (Sea Mail)  
Three months 8s.; six months 16s., one year 30s.

### AIRMAIL SUBSCRIPTION RATES


N. Africa and Middle East  
Three months 8s. 8d.; six months 17s. 4d.;  
one year 34s.

India, South, East and West Africa  
America and South-East Asia  
Three months 9s. 9d.; six months 19s. 6d.;  
one year 38s.

Australia and Far East  
Three months 10s. 10d.; six months 21s. 8d.;  
one year 42s.

Air Express Edition  
to US and all parts of America, from our US  
Sales Office, c/o American Friends Service Com-  
mittee, 20 South Twelfth St., Philadelphia 7, Pa.  
\$5 year, \$1 three months' trial.





1,174 Dec. 26, 1958 6d.

US Air Express  
Edition 10 cents

# VICTORY AT ACCRA

## A step towards a free Africa

By Dr. HOMER JACK

Accra, Ghana, December 13, 1958.

**THE first all-African People's Conference closed on a high emotional note today when 600 delegates and observers from all over Africa chanted, "In the struggle for Africa, there is victory for us." After being the focus of world attention for a whole week in Accra, delegates returned to all parts of Africa and the world, confident of at least seven solid achievements.**

1. The mere fact that the Conference was held was of prime importance. It gave the African people self-confidence. It put fear into the hearts of the colonial powers. Despite differences in language, political evolution, culture and ideology, 300 delegates from 62 political parties in 28 African countries and territories met together and reached a large measure of agreement. And they showed the imperialistic world—as Prime Minister Kwame Nkrumah told the closing session—"that Africans left alone can manage their own affairs."

2. The Conference set up a permanent organisation, also called the All-African People's Conference, with a secretariat in Accra, to implement the decisions of the Conference and to hold such a gathering each year. An invitation was extended by Tunisia for the next conference.

3. The Conference introduced nationalist leaders to each other. The human contacts cannot be minimised for the political future of Africa.

4. The Conference for the first time brought together nationalist leaders from Portuguese Angola and the Belgian Congo, two colonies which heretofore have had the minimum of independence activity. This was the first contact their leaders have had with other African freedom movements and with the outside world.

5. The Conference has helped make real the dream of Pan-Africanism. With

one regional confederation or union (of Ghana and Guinea) in existence, and with others projected (especially in East Africa), even a continent-wide United States of Africa is no longer merely the dream of expatriates in London or Harlem.

### Freedom Fund

6. The Conference did not sell its soul to any outside ideology. Prime Minister Nkrumah in the most widely discussed sentence of the entire conference cryptically remarked that "colonialism and imperialism may come to us yet in a different guise—not necessarily from Europe." Did he mean from America? From Russia? From Egypt? Or from Asia? All four were officially or unofficially represented at the Conference, but only the United Arab Republic had an official delegation. The Conference resolutions were friendly to all nations, but subservient to none. The Conference proposes "an African personality" in foreign relations, which is really a kind of African neutralism, but non-aligned even to Asia.

7. The Conference was a great African talk-fest, which was natural the first time around, but there were also solid accomplishment and specific recommendations for action. Chief among these was that April 15 each year would be celebrated as Africa Freedom Day throughout Africa until every acre of Africa is free and presumably thereafter in remembrance of those who struggled, and were often martyred, to make Africa free. Also the Conference established an African Freedom Fund to collect monies for emergency situations.

American observers—perhaps 50—half of whom were American Negroes.

### Tensions

The American Committee on Africa, headed by George Houser, was one of the most active fraternal delegations. (Praised by many African delegates, the American Committee was degraded by one UAR spokesman as "still American.") Not unexpected was the youth of the delegates (Mboya is less than 30). However, the number of woman delegates was exceptionally small.

Most surprising was that the anticipated ideological struggles were waged in pastel shades. Tensions between Accra and Cairo (Nkrumah and Nasser) were always below the surface, even though Nasser was not present and Nkrumah was only present in a speech-making capacity.

The tensions between Russia and the West were reflected in the Conference, but again only indirectly. A seven-man Russian delegation was present.

Yet none of these tensions ever threatened to break up the Conference. As a matter of fact, at the last moment the Conference steering committee excluded all Russians and all Americans as full delegates and thus both were excluded from the decision-making process.

The greatest visible tensions were between the French-speaking delegates and the others, the former maintaining that they were second-class delegates because of poor Conference arrangements for translation. Also these tensions grew out of different cultural approaches to problems.

### Gandhism

Most surprising of all, the one issue which ran throughout the Conference was the relevance of Gandhism to eliminate

## Strong language

By SYBIL MORRISON

*If post-war agreements, such as Yalta and Potsdam had been kept the world would have had complete peace today . . . Within one year the damned Russians broke 32 of those agreements. What are you going to do with an outfit like that? The only thing is to have more guns than they have and be ready to shoot them off if necessary.—Mr. Truman. Former U.S.A. President. December 9, 1958.*

I ADMIT to not knowing all these agreements, the breaking of which Mr. Truman accuses the Russians, but I know enough to say that there is plainly quite a little "pot and kettle" blackness in the matter.

Clause 11 of the Potsdam agreement for instance, in which it is set forth that Germany is to be completely disarmed and "the production of all arms, ammunition and implements of war shall be prohibited and prevented" sounds a little odd today after the deliberate support by this country of the re-arming of Western Germany.



It was also agreed at Potsdam that Japan should "be given an opportunity to end the war," which sounds very tolerant and reasonable, but as we now know, all the agreements at Potsdam were based upon the "unconditional surrender" policy, and the final clause of the agreement in regard to Japan reads: "We call upon the Government of Japan to proclaim now the unconditional surrender of all the Japanese armed forces, and to provide proper and adequate assurances of their good faith in such action. *The alternative for Japan is complete and utter destruction.*" (My italics). The signatories to this monstrous threat were Churchill and Truman with Chiang Kai-shek's approval.

It must also be remembered that Russia had not yet declared war on Japan and had informed Churchill and Truman of Japan's desire to negotiate a truce. "What are you going to do with an outfit like that?"

It is perfectly clear that the agreements made between the three Great Powers directly after the war was over, were already tainted with deception and mistrust, and if there were to be a careful examination it might well be revealed that no one country was much worse than another in this respect.

The tragedy is that Truman should reiterate the appalling policy of Potsdam, the policy in fact of the blackmailer and

PPU RELIGION COMMISSION  
CHRISTMAS SERVICE

Sunday, 3.30 p.m.; December 28  
FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE



future of Africa.

4. The Conference for the first time brought together nationalist leaders from Portuguese Angola and the Belgian Congo, two colonies which heretofore have had the minimum of independence activity. This was the first contact their leaders have had with other African freedom movements and with the outside world.

5. The Conference has helped make real the dream of Pan-Africanism. With

**PPU RELIGION COMMISSION  
CHRISTMAS SERVICE**

Sunday, 3.30 p.m.; December 28  
FRIENDS INTERNATIONAL CENTRE  
32 Tavistock Square, Euston  
Universal Centre and PPU Religion Commission

**Every Peace News reader needs a**

**PEACE DIARY FOR 1959**

3s. 6d. (postage 4d.)

Peace News, 3 Blackstock Road, N.4.

**PEACE LIBRARY**

(of U.S. Committee Against Militarization)

requests city and local branches as well as national and international peace organisations of all viewpoints (pacifist, leftist, political, labour, business, religious, UN Association, world government, etc., etc.) to send, gratis, all their circulars and publications issued in 1958 and subsequent years. Publications of U.S.C.A.M. and other USA peace groups will be sent in exchange—if requested.

Address: Albert Bofman, 913W. 69th Street,  
Chicago 21, Ill., USA.

**"THE STRATEGIST AND THE BOMB"**

**SIR STEPHEN KING-HALL**

Thursday 1st Jan. 11 a.m., CONWAY HALL Holborn W.C.1.

Nuclear Disarmament Lecture Series

ference proposes "an African personality" in foreign relations, which is really a kind of African neutralism, but non-aligned even to Asia.

7. The Conference was a great African talk-fest, which was natural the first time around, but there were also solid accomplishment and specific recommendations for action. Chief among these was that April 15 each year would be celebrated as Africa Freedom Day throughout Africa until every acre of Africa is free and presumably thereafter in remembrance of those who struggled, and were often martyred, to make Africa free. Also the Conference established an African Freedom Fund to collect monies for emergency situations.

**Disappointments**

If there were achievements, there were— to this observer—certain disappointments as well as surprises. French West and Equatorial Africa was represented, but not always by important African political leaders. Also Africa south of the Sahara was represented by no more than four white persons. Chief among them were the Rev. Michael Scott, who was a delegate for the Herero people of South West Africa, and Patrick Duncan of the Liberal Party of South Africa. Only one Indian delegate attended.

Also disappointing was the little discussion given to economic problems facing Africa and to the problems of nuclear war facing Africa and the world. Tom Mboya did warn the Great Powers not to use Africa as a battlefield for their wars and he did condemn the proposed testing of nuclear weapons over the Sahara by the French. This theme was echoed again by Michael Scott.

The delegations from Algeria and Guinea turned out to be the most popular, always greeted by applause, with South Africa running a close third. Kenya produced perhaps the strongest and most active delegation (including chairman Tom Mboya) with Nigeria and Egypt running second. Surprisingly unexpected was the number of

Russians and all Americans as full delegates and thus both were excluded from the decision-making process.

The greatest visible tensions were between the French-speaking delegates and the others, the former maintaining that they were second-class delegates because of poor Conference arrangements for translation. Also these tensions grew out of different cultural approaches to problems.

**Gandhism**

Most surprising of all, the one issue which ran throughout the Conference was the relevance of Gandhism to eliminate colonialism and racism in Africa.

No sooner had the first meeting of the Conference steering committee opened when the UAR delegate said that the purpose of the Conference—to develop a non-violent strategy for African independence—was not really pertinent, what with war in Algeria and potential anti-colonial wars elsewhere in Africa. This view was naturally supported by the Algerians, but also by many other delegates who felt that non-violence must mean non-resistance and they were in Accra to resist imperialism and racism. There were spirited defences of Satyagraha by delegates from South Africa, Kenya, Nigeria and Ghana, the latter in public speeches by Nkrumah and Ghana Foreign Minister Botsio.

Every day, in one session or another, this debate continued and undoubtedly served as a means by which certain other frustrations were lessened.

In the end the Conference reached this rhetorical compromise:

"Recognising that national independence can be gained by peaceful means in territories where democratic means are available, it guarantees its support to all forms of peaceful action; this support is pledged equally to those who, in order to meet the violent means by which they are subjected and exploited, are obliged to retaliate."

Those who believe in the way of Gandhi have a job of work to do in Africa. At least a proposal to form an African Legion of soldiers from all parts of Africa, initially to help the National Liberation Front in Algeria, was not pursued. But neither was Michael Scott's suggestion of forming a non-violent African army which one day might march on Pretoria!

It must also be remembered that Russia had not yet declared war on Japan and had informed Churchill and Truman of Japan's desire to negotiate a truce. "What are you going to do with an outfit like that?"

It is perfectly clear that the agreements made between the three Great Powers directly after the war was over, were already tainted with deception and mistrust, and if there were to be a careful examination it might well be revealed that no one country was much worse than another in this respect.

The tragedy is that Truman should reiterate the appalling policy of Potsdam, the policy in fact of the blackmailer and the thug. To indulge in abuse with nothing constructive to follow is to invite comparison with the lowest kind of criminal mentality.

★  
No doubt I may be accused in some quarters of using intolerant and abusive language myself! It is my view that Truman's recent statement warrants the strongest possible repudiation, made in the strongest possible language.

For responsible leaders in the world to threaten a whole country with total destruction, and by the use of the atom bomb to show they were coolly prepared to carry out the threat, is as great a crime as any with which the so-called "war criminals" were convicted and "hanged by the neck until they were dead."

For a man in Truman's position of influence, to suggest after all these horrors are over, and knowing the threat of total destruction which casts its black shadow upon us all, that there is no way of dealing with the Soviet Union than to engage in an arms race and be ready to use those arms, is not only an abrogation of all reason and responsibility, but a completely immoral attitude.

The majority of people have no idea to what broken agreements he refers, and no mention is made of agreements broken on the other side. The only real answer to all these difficulties today is exactly opposite to the one given by Mr. Truman. Banging off guns has clearly failed as a method; it is time that the guns were dropped and that a new method of negotiation was tried; negotiation based not upon threats but upon a sincere determination to find agreement. That would be not only new, but has in it the essence of peace, which is goodwill.

Published by Peace News Ltd., 3 Blackstock Road, London, N.4, and Printed in Great Britain by Fish & Cook Ltd., 135 Fonthill Road, N.4.